

ISSN 1343-8980

創価大学  
国際仏教学高等研究所  
年 報

令和三年度  
(第25号)

Annual Report  
of  
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University  
for the Academic Year 2021  
Volume XXV

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2022・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
Soka University  
Tokyo・2022

# Aśvaghōṣa's *Buddhacarita* in the Old Uigur Literature\*

Jens-Uwe HARTMANN, Klaus WILLE, and Peter ZIEME

*Genethliacon Dieter Maue octogenario dedicatum*

## Abstract:

The paper introduces three Sanskrit-Uigur bilingual fragments, which belong to three different manuscripts. Both languages are written in Central Asian Brāhmī. Two of the fragments overlap; they preserve excerpts from chapters 16 and 17 of Aśvaghōṣa's *Buddhacarita*. The third fragment includes almost the entire text of *Buddhacarita* 15.27d–38a, but not in full words; most of the Sanskrit words are reduced to their first syllable. The Sanskrit text of the second half of the *Buddhacarita* (chapters 14.32–28) is lost; the identification became possible only through lengthy quotations from the *Buddhacarita* in the *Tridaṇḍamālā* presently studied by Kazunobu Matsuda and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. The first two fragments (AtūHs I 25 and AtūHs II 115) belong to the German Turfan Collection. The find spot, Murtuq, is only known for one of these two. The third fragment (80 TBI 774b) was found in Bezeklik; it belongs to the collection of the Academia Turfanica.

## Keywords:

Uigur manuscripts, Sanskrit-Uigur bilingual texts, *Buddhacarita*, *Tridaṇḍamālā*

In 1954, Annemarie von Gabain published a volume containing fragments of sixteen manuscripts in old Uigur, all of which shared the same feature. They were written in a form of Indian Brāhmī rather than the usual Uigur script.<sup>1</sup> The first eight of them (A–H) were distinguished by a second feature: All were bilinguals, alternating between words or phrases of a Sanskrit text and their Uigur translations. As it turned out, there was yet another bilingual text among those sixteen, manuscript no. N, but this was disguised by a very unusual feature: The quotations from the Sanskrit did not consist of full words, but only of the first syllable of the first word in each quarter of a verse.<sup>2</sup> In all other fragments, the original Sanskrit text was either cited word for word, or represented by excerpts. This translation technique, of constant alternation between source and target language, seems to be characteristic of bilingual Tocharian,<sup>3</sup> Uigur, and Sogdian<sup>4</sup> texts written in Brāhmī. The reasons behind the choice to

---

\* It is our pleasant duty to thank Sophie Florence (Munich) for correcting the English and the Academia Turfanica for providing an excellent photograph of 80 TBI 774b.

1. Gabain 1954.

2. Hartmann/Maue 1991; the underlying Sanskrit text is Mātṛceṭa's *Varṇārḥavarṇa* (9.17d–22c), a poetic hymn to the Buddha. Only once, two Sanskrit *akṣaras* are cited: *stvadga* for (*satvā*)s *tvadga*(*taṃ*) in 9.19b.

3. For instance TochSprR(A) 391 (*Udānavarga* 12.15–13.1, verse by verse); TochSprR(B) 527 (*Catuspariṣat-sūtra*; cf. Couvreur 1968: 277f.); TochSprR(B) 542 (*Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*; cf. Waldschmidt 1955: 15ff.).

4. Maue/Sims-Williams 1991.

represent the entire Sanskrit text or to only excerpt it are unknown.

Annemarie von Gabain was already able to assign the manuscripts B and E to the *Udānavarga*, and most of the others were identified in the following years.<sup>5</sup> Only the texts D (described by von Gabain as *Kunstdichtung*, “poetical composition”) and F remained unidentified. When Dieter Maue described these two texts in his *Alttürkische Handschriften*,<sup>6</sup> he classified the first (AtüHs I 18) as *Lehrgedicht* (“didactic poem”) and the second (AtüHs I 25) rather ingeniously as “**Unbestimmtes Sūtra (?)**” (**unidentified** sūtra [?]). Indeed, there are certain indications in the Sanskrit quotations of the second text that this is a doctrinal text: It contains direct speech, and involves the Buddha and a monk, a combination that strongly suggests a canonical discourse. In his second volume of *Alttürkische Handschriften*, Maue published another manuscript (AtüHs II 115),<sup>7</sup> where he found that four lines overlap with AtüHs I 25 (von Gabain’s text F). He classified this additional manuscript as “**Unbestimmter Text aus dem Umfeld der Buddhavita**” (**unidentified** text from the context of the life of the Buddha). In his commentary on line v5, when Maue referred to the dialogue between Āsvajit and Śāriputra, he recognized the underlying story. In fact, he was but one step away from the final identification.

Recently, another source brought to light a part of the Sanskrit text quoted in AtüHs 25 and 115, and this made it possible for us to identify the bilingual as excerpts from chapters 16 and 17 of Āsvaghoṣa’s *Buddhacarita* (Bc). Chapters 16 and 17 belong to the second half of the Bc, the original Sanskrit text of which was lost.<sup>8</sup> In the last four years, nearly 140 verses of this lost half could be recovered through quotations in the *Tridaṇḍamālā* (TDM). We do hope that Dieter will share in our enormous pleasure in finding traces of Āsvaghoṣa’s work among the Uigur Buddhist manuscripts, and we re-edit the two fragments here as a birthday present and a fitting tribute to Dieter’s important contributions to Uigur and related studies.

The *Tridaṇḍamālā* is an amazing work.<sup>9</sup> Its colophon names none other than Āsvaghoṣa as the author, and, despite previous doubts, this is partly true. The text consists of forty chapters and contains forty canonical sūtras that form the core of each chapter. These sūtras are quoted in full. The remainder of the text consists of verses. Each chapter follows a similar structure: it begins with three verses paying homage to the Three Jewels, usually followed by another set of verses. The sūtra is then quoted, followed by another set of verses. The verses before and after the canonical text are more or less explicitly related to the central doctrinal concerns of the embedded sūtra. In some cases, these verses may have been composed on the basis of the sūtra quotation, but often they are selected from related passages in other works. There is a clear preference for sources connected with the name of Āsvaghoṣa. The compiler(s) of the *Tridaṇḍamālā* took the *Buddhacarita* and the *Saundarananda* as their main sources; so far, more than 300 verses from these two works have been identified.<sup>10</sup> There are

---

<sup>5</sup>. For an overview s. Hartmann/Maue 1996: 148–150.

<sup>6</sup>. Maue 1996: 75–76 (no. 18 = Mz 718) and 134 (no. 25 = Mz 626).

<sup>7</sup>. Maue 2015: 265–269 (no. 115 = U 6854).

<sup>8</sup>. Friedrich Weller could already recover part of the verses 16.20d–36d from a manuscript fragment found in Šorčuq at the northern route of the Silk Road, cf. Weller 1953; see also Salomon 2012: 96ff. for fragments of the *Buddhacarita* from Central Asia.

<sup>9</sup>. For a description cf. Hartmann forthcoming.

<sup>10</sup>. Editing the *Tridaṇḍamālā* is severely impeded by the fact that there is only one set of photographs available, taken by Giuseppe Tucci in 1939, and that many of these photographs are partly blurred, cf. Hartmann forthcoming.

at least two verses from the *Śāriputraprakaraṇa*,<sup>11</sup> and all forty verses of the *Śokavinodana*, an interesting little work known so far only from its Tibetan translation, which ascribes it to Aśvaghōṣa, could be recovered in the TDM.<sup>12</sup>

In chapter eight of the *Tridaṇḍamālā*, the verses Bc 16.76, 80–89 and 90–93 are quoted without attribution.<sup>13</sup> Eventually these verses could be identified with the help of the Tibetan translation of the *Buddhacarita*, which in turn allowed a new assessment of AtÜHs 25 and 115. The passage cited in the Uigur bilingual is longer than the quotation in the TDM, but again the Tibetan translation is a fairly reliable tool. Comparison with the Tibetan revealed that the Uigur manuscripts preserve the text beginning in 16.64c of the Tibetan translation and ending in 17.15c (again only Tibetan). Sometimes, it is rather difficult to exactly ascertain all the correspondences with the text of the *Buddhacarita*. There are two problems: Where we have the original Sanskrit text of the Bc, the mapping of the Sanskrit and Uigur excerpts on the text of the Bc is unambiguous, but when only the Tibetan is available, the allocations can become extraordinary difficult. This mainly has to do with the extremely rich vocabulary and the ornate poetic expressions that are easily available in Sanskrit but lack equivalents in Tibetan. A second problem is the fact that the Sanskrit/Uigur text contains explanatory additions, for instance the listing of the four supreme states (*brahmavihāra*) preserved in both manuscripts, evidently an explanation of the term *brāhmaiḥ*, which occurs as a Sanskrit excerpt immediately before the list of the *brahmavihāras*. A third problem is the underlying methodological rationale for excerpts, which is simply beyond our understanding: A number of verses are omitted, and the choice of excerpt seems arbitrary.

The name Aśvaghōṣa was not unknown to Uigur Buddhists—as evidenced in several texts that mention him. The *Maitrisimit* contains a list of Bodhisattva masters in India, which ends with the names Mātṛceta and Aśvaghōṣa.<sup>14</sup> The tenth scroll of the *Kṣanti Kīlguluk Nom Bitig* preserves the homage: *yükünürbiz ašvagoše bodis(a)t(a)[v kuti]-ṇa* “we bow to the majesty of Bodhisattva Aśvaghōṣa” (南無馬鳴菩薩).<sup>15</sup> Moreover, the biography of Xuanzang reports that “at that time Aśvaghōṣa in the east, Kāṇadeva in the south, Nāgārjuna in the west and Kumārajīva in the north were the four luminaries”.<sup>16</sup> All these references are rather unspecific, however, and none of them connects directly to Aśvaghōṣa’s fame as a poet. AtÜHs 25 and 115 provide the first witnesses to the fact that at least one of his works was known among the Uigurs. This is the right moment to draw attention to yet another bilingual Sanskrit-Uigur manuscript of the Bc. While working on the present paper, we asked Dieter Maue for his opinion on the various forms of quotation in the bilinguals. As an illustration of another method, he sent us his paper on 80 TBI 774 b, a bilingual manuscript from Bezeklik.<sup>17</sup> With Aśvaghōṣa at the forefront of our minds, and Maue’s excellent edition in

---

<sup>11.</sup> Hartmann/Matsuda forthcoming (2022).

<sup>12.</sup> Hartmann/Matsuda/Szántó in print 2022.

<sup>13.</sup> Published in Matsuda 2019 and Matsuda forthcoming; Eltschinger 2013 discusses this passage based on the Tibetan translation.

<sup>14.</sup> Geng/Klimkeit 1988: 52–53, line 575.

<sup>15.</sup> Wilkens 2007: 286–287, lines 3902–3903.

<sup>16.</sup> Dietz/Ölmez/Röhrborn 2015: 191–193. Zieme 2014 edited and translated three fragments from texts dealing with the life of the Buddha, but none of them seems connected to the *Buddhacarita*. Similarly, there is a work in Old Uigur with the title *Budačarit*, clearly a representation of the Skt word *buddhacarita*, which, however, appears to have nothing to do with Aśvaghōṣa’s work, cf. Zieme 1985: 51ff.

<sup>17.</sup> Maue/Niu 2012 in an E-Mail dated December 21, 2021.

front of us, it was possible to identify the text as *Buddhacarita* 15.27d–37d.<sup>18</sup> Since the identification came too late for a new edition, we include only a list of the Sanskrit correspondences as an appendix.

There is a marked difference between the manuscript from Bezeklik and the two fragments published here. While the latter two manuscripts contain only excerpts, the former covers the Sanskrit text more or less completely, but again in an unusual fashion: In most cases, a Sanskrit word or compound is quoted only by its first syllable. All three manuscripts most likely ended with a colophon containing the name of either the poet or the work (perhaps even both), or preserved another indication of their context or function. It is exactly this latter point, the function of such a manuscript, that gives rise to questions. One question is the purpose of a bilingual list of excerpts for a work of ornate Sanskrit poetry. Such a list of quotations of sporadic words, or of the first syllables of nearly all words with their respective Uigur translations, would not allow one to memorize the Sanskrit original, nor help in understanding the text, nor do the selected words suggest themselves in the sense of a subject index comparative to an *uddāna*, for example. Another question derives from the fact that the identification of the three manuscripts is based on the quotations preserved in the TDM. Is it possible that the manuscripts do not represent the text of the *Buddhacarita* itself, but citations thereof used in a ritual context similar to that of the TDM?<sup>19</sup> These questions clearly require further study.

Here we present the two manuscripts in transliteration and transcription. Following the transcription of every side of the folios, we list the references to either the Sanskrit or the Tibetan text of the *Buddhacarita*. These references are sometimes doubtful, and we have not always been able to relate the excerpt in the bilingual to a word or an expression in the Bc in the parts preserved only in the Tibetan translation. This is largely due to the fact that the Sanskrit is excerpted very unevenly: In AtūHs I 25r, line 2 preserves excerpts from Bc 16.46–47, while line 4 covers words from 16.62–63. Line 8, on the other hand, contains two excerpts representing continuous text of 16.85c–d, and the same holds true for AtūHs I 25v, line 1, which has two lengthy excerpts with continuous text of 16.91c–d. The following line 2, however, belongs to 17.2, which means that five verses are skipped (16.92–95 and 17.1). Although the Tibetan translation has been described as “uneven and in places disappointingly poor,”<sup>20</sup> it is extremely helpful. However, it does not verbally reproduce the Sanskrit, and this results in ambiguities which sometimes prevent definite equations of the Sanskrit excerpts in the Uigur manuscripts with the text of the *Buddhacarita*.

### Technical instructions

- punctuation mark
- space left blank for the string hole
- + equivalent of 1 *akṣara*
- × part of an *akṣara*
- ... text of undefined extent
- a* uncertain reading
- [ ] loss

<sup>18</sup>. The complete chapter is quoted in the *Tridaṇḍamālā*, see Matsuda 2020.

<sup>19</sup>. Cf. also below the considerations on the practical use of the manuscript from Bezeklik.

<sup>20</sup>. Jackson 1997: 40, but see also Eimer 2008: 76; for the translators cf. Martin 2014.

[jakah]	lost text restored by conjecture
<a>	restored by emendation
{a}	deletion by emendation
-t	in transliteration: t in <i>virāma</i> position

The translations of the Sanskrit and the Tibetan usually follow Johnston 1937: 39–46 with occasional borrowings from Eltschinger 2013: 176–186. The Tibetan text follows Weller 1926: 272–288.

**Fragment 1: AtūHs I 25** (Mainz 626; T III M 145); first edition in Gabain 1954: 45–47, Text F, with a facsimile of the verso side as Tafel II; described in AtūHs I 25: 134 (facsimiles Tafel 69–70); for a digital image see DTA Mainz0626.

### Transliteration recto

- 1 [ ... ] × • nā nā rū pā b<sup>hi</sup> ṛ dd<sup>hi</sup> bhi • oy[ ] [ ... ]
- 2 [ ... ] kā śya pe lā ryu zyā ymyā tya nri bu rhām ā ndā-g<sub>1</sub> o-hk<sub>1</sub> yā ltri ti • vṛ dd<sup>ha</sup> ta mai • hk<sup>ha</sup> ri lā ryu zy[ ] [ ... ]
- 3 [ ... ] smṛ/spṛ ndyā/wye • oya ni ū g<sub>1</sub>u-l<sub>1</sub> • ke tyā rri-p aya rsyā-r ymyā • gu ṇam • aya d<sup>h</sup>g<sub>1</sub>yu lyā rri-g<sub>1</sub> • vyāpi • ye ti ryu • i ṣṭa sya ca • ye g<sub>1</sub>[ ] [ ... ]
- 4 [ ... ] × vi n[ ] yā cā rya • yā wā lmi ślā rṇi-n pā h[ ] i si ○ b<sup>hi</sup> nne ṣu • ā ti rtlā mi ślā rd<sup>ha</sup> • sa mṛ [ ... ]
- 5 [ ... ] tti × • pa ri ka ra • kā wzā tti-p • ā sa jya • y[ ] i-p • śre ○ ya se • ye g<sub>1</sub>kyā • vya pai ti ca • tā ri k[ ] [ ... ]
- 6 [ ... ] ni tya e va vā • uyu [ ]/yu klyu-g<sub>1</sub> [ ] y[ ] rsyā-r ymyā uyu rlyu ksyu-z aya rsyā-r ymyā • vai p<sup>ha</sup> lam ka rma nā mb<sup>ha</sup> ve-t kī li-ñc tyu ṣṣyu [ ... ]
- 7 [ ... ] [ ] myā • vyai ti • yo kā tmā-z • na ca syā nna kva ci tsthī ta • ñyā-n b<sup>ho</sup> lmā g<sub>1</sub>ā-y aya rd<sup>hi</sup> kā ndā aya rsyā-r tu rd<sup>ha</sup> ci • ni ṣkri ya syā sya • [ ... ]
- 8 [ ... ] du k<sup>ha</sup>am hi • oya skyā sam li-g<sub>1</sub> i ñci-p aya mg<sub>1</sub>yā-k<sub>1</sub> • ka ku ryā dā tma nā tma na • ki-m kī lg<sub>1</sub>ā-y oya-z aya tyo zkyā • vi kri yā • [ ... ]

### Transcription recto

- 1 [ ... ] × • nānārūpābhi<h> ṛddhibhi<h> • oy[ ] [ ... ]
- 2 [ ... ] kāśyapelar ūzā ymā tāñri burhan andag ok yaltriti • vṛddhatamai<h> • karilar ūz[ā ... ]
- 3 [ ... ] smṛ/spṛ ndyā/wye • ōñi ugul • ketārip ārsār ymā • guṇam • ādgūlārig • vyāpi • yetirū • i ṣṭa sya ca • yeg [ ] [ ... ]
- 4 [ ... ] × vin[e]yācārya<h> • yavalmiṣṭlarniṅ pah[ṣ]īsi bhinneṣu • adīrtlamiṣṭlārda • samṛ [ ... ]
- 5 [ ... ] tti × • parikara<h> • kavzatip • āsajya y[il]ip • śreyase • yegkā • vyapaiti ca • tarik[ar ]
- 6 [ ... ] nitya eva vā • ū[r]lūklūg ārsār ymā ūrlūksūz ārsār ymā • vaiphal<y>am karmaṇam bhavet kīlīnč tūṣṣū[z]
- 7 [ ... ] [y]mā • vyaiti • yokadmaz • na ca syān na kvacit sthita • nāñ bolmagay ārdi kanda ārsār turdači • niṣkriyasyāsyā • [ ... ]
- 8 [ ... ] du<h>kham hi • öskā sanlig inčip āmgāk • ka<h> kuryād ātmanātmanah • kim kīlgay öz ātözkā • vikriyā • [ ... ]

## References and Commentary

### 1

*nānārūpābhir rddhibhir* “with various supernatural powers” seems to correspond perfectly to 16.64c *sna tshogs rdzu ’phrul*, but it must refer to the simple *rdzu ’phrul gyis* 16.36a “through supernatural powers”;  
oy[ ] : this *akṣara* can be the beginning of Uig. ö[ŋi] “various” as equivalent of Skt. *nānā-*.

### 2

[üč] *kāśyapelar üzä ymä täñri burhan andag ok yaltriti* “through the [three] Kāśyapas also the divine Buddha radiated thus”; this must refer to 16.46d *’od srungs gsum gyis sangs rgyas mdzes* “through the three Kāśyapas the Buddha was beautified”.  
*vṛddhatamaiḥ* “through the oldest (= most venerable) ones” : 16.47c *bgres mchog de rnams kyis*<sup>21</sup> : *karılar üzä* “through the aged”.

### 3

[...] *smṛ/spr ndyā/wye*: it is not clear if this is Sanskrit or Uig. Annemarie von Gabain (1954: 45) read *ṛndyā*, but the reading of the first *akṣara* is highly uncertain : öñi *ugul ketärip ärsär ymä* “and if someone removes a child”. It is noteworthy that the order of words is incorrect insofar as one would expect *ugul öñi ketärip ärsär ymä*; meaning and allocation remain unclear;  
*guṇam* “quality” : *ädgülärig* “the qualities” (acc. pl.); unclear;  
*vyāpi* “pervading” : *yetirü* or *yätirü* “till”;<sup>22</sup> unclear;  
*iṣṭasya ca* “and of the cherished” : *yeg* “good”; unclear.

### 4

[...] *vin[e]yācārya* : 16.62c *’dul ba’i slob dpon gau ta mas : yavalmišlarnıñ bah[š]ı*<sup>23</sup> “master of the tamed ones”, cf. HWAU 877a.  
*bhinneṣu* “among the various (Laws)”: this seems to refer to 16.63c *tha dad chos rnams su* (for *tha dad* = *bhinna* cf. Negi s.v.), most likely for *bhinneṣu dharmeṣu* : *atırtlamišlarda* “among those who have recognized”; cf. AtüHs II 115 r3;  
*samṛ* [...] impossible to allocate.

### 5

[...] *tī* ×: unclear; Dieter Maue (AtüHs. II: 266–267, 115r4) suggests to reconstruct to *[ya]tdi [ymä]* “und lag doch”;  
*parikara* “retinue” : 16.75b *dang bcas* “provided with” (?) : *kavzattıp* “surrounding” (a converb form);<sup>24</sup> unclear;  
*āsajya* “having adhered to” : 16.75c *nye bar len min* “there is no appropriation” (?) : Uig.

<sup>21</sup>. Cf. Johnston 1937: 40, note 2.

<sup>22</sup>. A postposition *yetirü* “till” derived from the verb *yetir-* “to reach” is known today only in some South Siberian Turkic languages such as Hakas, Šor and Tuvan, cf. Li 2004: 549–55.

<sup>23</sup>. Gabain 1954: 45 still read *pāhśisi*.

<sup>24</sup>. HWAU 349a considers all variations of the verb *kavza-*, *kavzat-* und *kavzatıl* as variants of *kavša-*, *kavšat-* und *kavšatıl-*.

*y[il]lip*<sup>25</sup> “having adhered to”; not sure;  
*śreyase* “for the better state” could refer to 16.77c *mchog tu* “supreme” or 77d *mya ngan ’das pa* “Nirvāṇa” : Uig. *yegkā* “for the better” (dative); not certain;  
*vyapaiti ca* “and goes apart, ceases” : 78d *rnam par grol* “are released from” (?) : *tarık[ar]* “(sth.) goes apart”; the attribution is uncertain.

## 6

[*nityo vā*]*nitya eva vā* “be it either permanent or impermanent” : 16.80b *nityo vānitya eva vā* :  
*ürlüklüg ärsär ymä ürlüksüz ärsär ymä* „be it everlasting, be it not-everlasting also”;  
*vaiphal*<*y*>*aṃ karmaṇām bhavet* “there would be no fruit of the act” : 16.81b *vaiphalyaṃ karmmaṇām bhavet* : *kılınč tüšsü[z]* “without fruit of the act”.

## 7

*ymä*: this word is probably the last one of an excerpt for which the Skt. is missing;  
*vyeti* “(neither) passes away” : 16.82d *vyeti* : Uig. *yokadmaz* “does not get extinct”;  
*na ca syān na kvacit sthita*<*ḥ*> “[there] would be no place where it is not” : 16.83b *na ca syān na kvacit sthitaḥ* : *näñ bolmagay ärdi kanda ärsär turdači* “it should not be that he is standing wherever it may be”; cf. below, AtüHs II 115r6;  
*niṣkriyasyāsyā* “of this inactive [self]” : 16.84a *niṣkriyasyāsyā*; cf. below, AtüHs II 115r7.

## 8

[...] *duḥkham hi* “suffering” : 16.85c *duḥkham hi* : *öskä sanlıg inčip ämgäk* “the suffering which is just belonging to the self”. The Uigur translation may also refer to *duḥkham ātmanaḥ* 16.85b “suffering to himself”, but the *hi* in Sanskrit clearly points to verse 85c.  
*kaḥ kuryād ātmanātmanaḥ* “who would cause suffering to himself” : 16.85d *kaḥ kuryād ātmanātmanaḥ* : *kim kılgay öz ätözkä* “who will do it for his own body?”  
*vikriyā* [...] “change” : 16.86b or 86d *vikriyā* : Uig. [...]r, unclear.

## Transliteration verso

- 1 [ ... ] -r • u hya te • aya ltyu-r • pra va rta te ya ta pra vı tti • aya wri ltyu-r • k̄a yu tim  
b<sup>h</sup>o lo-r • smṛ ti ci tti ka rma ṇā-m • oya-g<sub>1</sub> tyā g<sub>1</sub>iṃ myā-k̄ [ ... ]
- 2 [ ... ] na • syā rri lyu • brā hmai śca • tyo-rt tyo rlyu-g<sub>1</sub> za rṇā aya ri-g<sub>1</sub> lyā rri uyu zyā •  
kuśa la sā sra va cyaṃ • mai tri 1 ka rūm 2 mu di-t 3 u pe × [ ... ]
- 3 [ ... ] bu dd<sup>h</sup>a • tyā ṇri bu rhām • b<sup>h</sup>ai kṣe psa yā • pi nwā-dh ti lyā g<sub>1</sub>yā li kyu syu syu  
zyā • k̄a pi lo bhi kṣu-r • saṃ ja yi ā tli-g<sub>1</sub> pa ri vrā × [ ... ]
- 4 [ ... ] [ ]i-p • nā smiṃ śa kto • u ttā ci aya rmyā-z myām • pu lā ka ○ mā traṃ • ā-z  
hkyā tyā ṇi ṇcyā • stoka • [ ... ]
- 5 [ ... ] × ca yli-g<sub>1</sub> • k̄a li lig<sub>1</sub> • bau dd<sup>h</sup>a ttu śā strā-d • ○ tyā ṇri bu rhām ṇi-ṇ no mi ndiṃ  
• gā nham/rham [ ... ]
- 6 [ ... ] [ ]i-p • ta ntu • si ṇi rkyā lyā rri • yi pkyā lyā rri • a nu ba d<sup>h</sup>nā ti • e yiṃ u lā lu-r  
• a ṇu re vaṃ • i ṇckyā kyā oya-k̄ • [ ]ā [ ... ]
- 7 [ ... ] × nā ka smi ko hi • ti ltā hsi-z aya rmyā-z i ṇci-p pu rva k̄a rme va • oya ṇryā ā

<sup>25</sup>. Gabain 1954: 45 still read *ylip*.



- žu ndā kī kī li [ ... ]  
8 [ ... ] [ ]i ñca • co-g<sub>1</sub> lu-g<sub>1</sub> yā liṃ li-g<sub>1</sub> × [ ... ]

### Transcription verso

- 1 [ ... ] -r • uhyate • ältür • pravartate yata<h> pravṛtti<h> • ävrilür {•} kayutın bolor • smṛticittikarmaṇām • ög tāginmāk[...]  
2 [ ... ] na • sārili • brāhmaīś ca • tört törlüg zarwa äriglāri üzä • kuśalasāsra-p cyam • maitri 1 karun 2 mudit 3 upe[kš 4 ... ]  
3 [ ... ] buddha • täñri burhan • bhaikšepsayā • pinvat tilägäli küsüş üzä • kāpilo bhikṣur • saṃjayi atlıg parivra[jakaḥ ... ]  
4 [ inč]ip • nāsmiṃ śakto • uttači ärmaz män • pulākamātram • azk(ı)ya täñinčä • stoka • [ ... ]  
5 [ ... ] × caylıg • kalılıg • bauddhāt tu śāstrād • täñri burhannıñ nomındın • gānham/ rham [ ... ]  
6 [ ... ] [ ]i-p • tantu<h> • siñirkälāri yipkälāri • anubadhnāti • eyin ulalur • aṇur evam • inčkākā ök • [ ]ā [ ... ]  
7 [ ... ] × nākasmiko hi • tıltagsız ärmaz inčip p<ü>rvakārmeva • öñrä aṇundakı kılı[nč] [ ... ]  
8 [ ... ] [ ]i ñca • čoglug yalınlıg × [ ... ]

### References and Commentary

#### 1

*uhyate* “bears away” : 16.90b *uhyate* : *ältür* for *eltür* “he carries away”;  
*pravartate yata<h> pravṛtti<h>* “develops, whence ... come into activity” : 16.91cd  
*pravartate yataḥ pravṛttiḥ* : *ävrilür kayutın bolor* “he turns from where he is”;  
*smṛticittikarmaṇām* “memory, cognition and acts” : 16.91d *smṛtibuddhikarmaṇām* : *ög tāginmāk* “thought, sensation”, the Uig. translation of karma is in the following lacuna; it is impossible to decide which variant, *citti* or *buddhi*, is the original, since they are synonyms and metrically equivalent.

#### 2

[...] *na* : *sārili* “ceasing” or “resting”; unclear;  
*brāhmaīś ca* “with the brahmic (states)” : 17.2c *tshangs dang* id.: *tört türliüg zarwa äriglāri üzä* “with the four kinds of *brahmavihāra*”;  
*kuśalasāsra-p cyam*<sup>26</sup>: apparently an insertion by the Uigur scholar(s), since there is no correspondence in the Bc; although the same expression is attested below in AtūHs II 115 v3, its meaning remains obscure.<sup>27</sup> The following Uig. text *maitri 1 karun 2 mudit 3 upek[š 4]* lists the four *brahma-vihāras*, *maitrī*, *karuṇā*, *muditā* and *upekṣā*, evidently as an explanation of the “brahmic (states)”.<sup>28</sup> The preceding *brāhmaīś ca* is

<sup>26</sup>. The reading of the *akṣara* we transliterate as *cyam* is not sure; it could also be *vyam*. In the parallel passage in AtūHs. II: 267–268, 115v3, Dieter Maue reads *d<sup>h</sup>yām* for *dhyāna*, but the manuscript clearly has a short *a*, and the letter *dh-* normally has no top line. Reading and meaning remain doubtful. On the other hand, the short *a* speaks for an Uigur spelling, and *dyan* < *dhyāna* may fit the idea of the *brahmavihāras*.

<sup>27</sup>. Cf. Maue 2015: 268 „heilsame, (aber mit schlechten) Einflüssen behaftete Versenkung“.

<sup>28</sup>. For another Uigur reference to the four *brahmavihāra* cf. Zieme 2021: 14.

probably part of the phrase *brāhmaiś ca viḥārāiḥ*; Johnston (1937: 45) misunderstood Tib. *tshangs dang lha dang de bzhin 'phags pa rnam kyis ni || gnas pa de dang de yis sangs rgyas rnam par gnas* as “the Buddha dwelt in the Vihāra in company with Brahmā, the gods and saintly beings (*ārya*) of the various spheres of existence (*viḥāra*?)”. However, the Tibetan is clearly a reference to *trayo viḥārāḥ | divyo viḥāro brahmaviḥāra āryo viḥārāḥ*, cf. SWTF s.v. *brahma-vihāra* for references.

### 3

*buddha* : 17.2d *sangs rgyas* “Buddha” : *tāñri burhan* “divine Buddha”; cf. below, AtūHs II 115v4;

*bhaiḥṣepsayā* “in search of alms” : 17.3b *bsod snyoms 'dod pas* “in search of alms” : *pinvadh tilägäli küsüš üzä* “with the wish to beg for alms”; cf. below, AtūHs II 115v4;

*kāpilo bhikṣur* “a mendicant of Kapila’s sect” : 17.4a *ser skya'i rigs kyi dge slong : samjayi athig parivrajaka ... inčip* “a parivrājaka (monk) called Saṃjaya ... now”; it is noteworthy that the Uig. translator replaced the name Kapila with Saṃjaya, a famous agnostic philosopher, but cf. also the Chinese translation T 192 (transl. Willemen 2009: 123, verse 17.5).

### 4

...

*nāsmi śakto* “I am not capable” : 17.7b *nus pa ma yin no : uttači ärmäz män* “I am not one who is able”;

*pulākamātram* “a small portion” : 17.7d *nyung ngu (cung zad) tsam zhig (?) : azk(ı)a täñinčä* “along a small amount”; the allocation of this and the following excerpt remains slightly uncertain.

*stoka* : 17.7d *(nyung ngu) cung zad (tsam zhig) (?) : [...]* *caylıg kalılıg* mit “with a [...] *caylıg*<sup>29</sup> remainder”.

### 5

*bauddhāt tu śāstrād* “from the Buddha’s teaching” : 17.11d *sangs rgyas pa yi bstan las : tāñri burhanniñ nomındın* “from the teaching of the divine Buddha”;

*gānham* [...] or *gārham* [...] : *[inč]ip* “but”(?) ; impossible to understand.

### 6

*tantu* “thread, fibre” : 17.13b *snal ma* (cf. Negi s.v.) : *siñirk(i)yäläri yipk(i)yäläri* “his veins and his threads”;

*anubadhnāti* “holds together” : 17.13b *'brel ba : eyin ulalur* “it further continues” = “constantly” (?);

*añur evaṃ* “fine thus” : 7.13b *phra mo nyid : inčkäk(i)yä ök* “just fine”; Tib. and Uig. both support *eva* instead of the meaningless *evaṃ*.

### 7

[...] *nākasmiko hi* “(is) not without a cause” : 17.17d *gtan tshig med ma yin id. : tıltagsız*

---

<sup>29</sup>. [...] *caylıg* is unclear.

*ärmāz inčip* “it is not without reason”;  
*p<sup><ū></sup>rvakarmeva* “exactly the previous deed” : not in Tib. : *öjrä aždakı kılınč* “deed of a previous existence”; there is no immediate equivalent in the Tibetan translation. Willemen (2009: 125) renders the first part of verse 21 in the Chinese translation (= verse 19 of the Tibetan) as “As the fine fruition of a cause they had long ago planted”, which seems to express a similar thought. The Tibetan has *las dang bsam pa rnam dag* “purified by their actions and dispositions”, which would presuppose *karma*, but is even less close. The exact correspondence of this line remains open.

## 8

[...] *inčä čoglug yalınlig* “bright and shining like [...]”; this could either refer to the description of Mahākāśyapa in verse 24 or to that of the Buddha in verse 25.

**Fragment 2: AtūHs II 115** (U 6854); described and edited in AtūHs II 115: 265–269 (for a digital image see DTA U 6854); our edition follows AtūHs II 115 with minor changes.

### Transliteration recto

- 1 [ ... ] × [ ... ]
- 2 [ ... ] × ñ[ ] × nme/tme • pi lti-m myam • śra [ ] d<sup>h</sup>[ ] ja na [ ... ]
- 3 [ ... ] × yā • bhi nne šu • ā ti [ + ] mi ślā rtā × [ ... ]
- 4 [ ... ] × rtyā tyā-g<sub>1</sub> • śi šye cai va • yā tti ymya [ ... ]
- 5 [ ... ] ma k̄si-z • pra vṛ to yam • eya wri lmi śyā ryu rb<sup>h</sup>o • a sa [ ... ]
- 6 [ ... ] b<sup>h</sup>ū śca syā-n/t • eya rklyi-g<sub>1</sub> po lti eya rsyā-r̄ • syā nnā × [ ... ]
- 7 [ ... ] × yā-r̄ tu ttā/rtā ci [ ] i škri ya syā × [ + + ] × ā [ ... ]
- 8 [ ... ] [ ] × [ ] i [ ] i [ ] × [ ... ]

### Transcription recto

- 1 [ ... ] × [ ... ]
- 2 [ ... j] ñ[ā] tam me • bildim măn • śra[d] dh[ā] jana- [ ... ]
- 3 [ ... ] ā • bhinneṣu • adī[rtla] mišlarda × [ ... ]
- 4 [ ... °lā] rdā tāg • śiśye caiva • yatdı ymā [ ... ]
- 5 [ ... ] maksız • pravṛt<t>o ’yam • āvrilmiš ārūr bo • asa[ ... ]
- 6 [ ... vi] bhūs ca syān/t • ārklig boldı ārsār • syān nā [ ... ]
- 7 [ ... ] ār tutdaçı/tur° <•> [n] iškriyasyā × [ + + ] [sy] ā [ ... ]
- 8 [ ... ] [ ] × [ ] i [ ] i [ ] × [ ... ]

### References and Commentary

#### 2

[j] ñ[ā] tam me “I know” : 16.61c *bdag gis shes pa ste* : *bildim măn* “I knew”;<sup>30</sup>  
*śra[d] dh[ā] jana* [ ... ] : probably to be restored to *śraddhājanana* “productive of faith” : 16.62a  
*dad skyed cing* “productive of faith”.

<sup>30</sup>. In modern Turkish the past tense is also used for the present.

## 3

*bhinneṣu* : 16.63c *tha dad chos rnams su* : *adī[rtla]miṣlārda* ×: cf. above, AtūHs I 25 r4.

## 4

[<sup>o</sup>lā]rdā tāg “as in the [...]”; there are three comparisons in verse 16.66;

*śiṣye caiva* (based on the Uigur, Maue corrects *śiṣye* to *śiṣye*, cf. AtūHs II: 266–267) “and even lay down”: 16.66d *gzims pa'o* : *yatdi ymā* [...] “even lay down [...]”.

## 5

[...] *maksız* “without [...]”; allocation unclear;

*pravṛt<t>o* 'yaṃ “this having been produced” : 16.79d *rab tu 'jug 'di* (cf. Negi s.v.) “this practice” : *ävrilmiṣ ärür bo* “this is what has revolved”;

*asa* [...] unclear.

## 6

[vī]bhūś ca syān “if it were all-pervading” : 16.82a *vibhuś ca syān* : *ärklig boldı ärsär* “if it were almighty”;

*syān nā* [...] or *syāt tā* [...]: possibly a mistake for 16.82b *na syātām antajanmanī* “[there] would be neither death nor birth”; or does it already belong to 16.83ab *syān na ca syān*, cf. above, AtūHs I 25 r7?

## 7

[...]är *tutdači/turdači*<sup>31</sup> “[ ] holding” (?). If read *turdači*, “standing” (?);

[n]iṣkriyasyā[sya + + sy]ā : 16.84ab *niṣkriyasyāsyā na ca syāt karmmaṇām kriyā* “of this inactive [self], and there would be no doing of acts”; cf. above, AtūHs I 25 r7.

### Transliteration verso

- 1 [ ... ] dd<sup>h</sup>[ ] kt[ ]/kn[ ] yo-<sup>k</sup> tā/ā ptā ×m[ ] ṣyā ryu-<sup>r</sup> • u hya [ ... ]
- 2 [ ... ] my[ ] rru-g<sub>1</sub> tā oya ṇi eya rmyā-z rru-g<sub>1</sub> ymya k<sup>u</sup> lñā t[ ] [ ... ]
- 3 [ ... ] ku śa la sā sra-p<sub>2</sub> cyam • mai tri 1 ka rūṃ 2 mu di-t 3 u pe [ ... ]
- 4 [ ... ] × rya/rpa rd<sup>h</sup>i • bu dd<sup>h</sup>a • tyā ṇri pu rhām • bhai kṣe psa yā • pi ṇ[ ] [ ... ]
- 5 [ ... ] × • pi ryo kci syo zlyā g<sub>1</sub>yā li u muṃ sā rsyām • [ ... ]
- 6 [ ... ] sa rva me kā rt<sup>h</sup>aṃ • b<sup>h</sup>a [ ]ca • no mlā-<sup>r</sup> • ke [ ... ]
- 7 [ ... ] ṇi-ṇ [ ]o [ ]i ttiṃ<sup>32</sup> × × [ + + ] zyā
- 8 [ ... ] × [ ... ]

### Transcription verso

- 1 [ ... ]ddh[ ]kt[ ] yokdap ta[l]m[1]ṣ ärür • uhya [ ... ]
- 2 [ ... y]m[ā] (u)rugda öṇi ärmäß (u)rug ymā kulṇad[in ... ]
- 3 [ ... ] kuśalāsrap cyam • maitri 1 karun 2 mudit 3 upe[kṣ ... ]
- 4 [ ... ]r ärdi/bardi • buddha • tāṇri burhan • bhaikṣepsayā • pin[vat ... ]

<sup>31</sup>. The diacritics have been retraced by another hand.

<sup>32</sup>. Maue read *ndiṃ*.

- 5 [ ... ] birökči sözlägäli umunsar sän • [ ... ]  
 6 [ ... ] sarvam ekārtham • barča • nomlar • ke [ ... ]  
 7 [ ... ] nIṅ [n]o[m]indın × × [ + + ü]zä  
 8 [ ... ] × [ ... ]

## References and Commentary

### 1

[...] *ddh[ ]kt[ ] yokdap ta[l]m[ı]š ärür*: the first part must be Sanskrit, but cannot be restored. The Uig. equivalent is difficult to understand, as already shown by AtüHs II: 268. Maue's proposal "indem er zugrunde geht, wird er schwach" cannot be confirmed as long as the localization is unclear;  
*uhyate* "bears away" : 16.90b *uhyate*; cf. above, AtüHs I 25 v1.

### 2

[y]m[ä] (*u*)*rugda öñi ärmäz (u)rug ymä kuljad[ın ... ]*; "and (the shoot) is not different from the seed, and the seed [is not different from] the shoot" (cf. AtüHs II: 268); this must belong to 16.93 *ji ltar bon las ni myu gu skye ba ste || myu gu des ni sa bon de ni shes min zhing* "Just as the shoot is produced from the seed, and yet the shoot is not to be identified with the seed"; cf. also Chin. (T 192, transl. Willemen 2009: 120, verse 89) "A shoot grows because of a seed, but the seed is not the shoot."

### 3

*kuśālasasrap cyam • maitri 1 karun 2 mudit 3 upe[kš ... ]*: cf. above, AtüHs I 25 v2; Maue emends to *kuśālasasrap dyan*, cf. AtüHs II 115 v3.

### 4

[...] *r ärdi/bardı*: it is difficult to decide between *ärdi* "he was" or *bardı* "he went"; allocation unclear;  
*buddha* : 17.2d *sangs rgyas : täñri burhan* "divine Buddha"; cf. above, AtüHs I 25 v3;  
*bhaikṣepsayā* : 17.3b *bsod snyoms 'dod pas : pin[vat ... ]*: cf. above, AtüHs I 25 v3.

### 5

*birökči sözlägäli umunsar sän* "If you think [or: hope] to speak": does it refer to 17.5 *smros* "just tell me"?

### 6

*sarvam ekārtham* "all expressing the same meaning" : ? : *barča • nomlar* "all dharmas"; impossible to find a correspondence;  
*ke [...]* unclear.

### 7

[...] *nIṅ [n]o[m]indın × × [ + + ü]zä*; unclear, but cf. AtüHs. I 25 v5 *tya ñri bu rhām ñi-ñ no mi ndiṃ = täñri burhanniñ nomindın* "from the teaching of the divine Buddha".

## Appendix: The bilingual text 80 TBI 774b from Bezeklik

In what follows, we present a list of the correspondences between the Sanskrit quotations in the bilingual manuscript 80 TBI 774b from Bezeklik and chapter 15 of the *Buddhacarita*. The Sanskrit of the bilingual is based on Maue/Niu 2012, but with input from the photograph; this input allowed for an immediate examination of corrections that resulted from the comparison with the text of the *Buddhacarita* as quoted in the *Tridaṇḍamālā*, published in Matsuda 2020. The list serves two purposes: first, to document and justify the identification and second, to foreground the way in which the Uigur author(s) dealt with the Sanskrit text. A new edition of the whole manuscript is now an urgent desideratum.

The Uigur manuscript cites enough characteristic words to leave no doubt that the underlying text is *Buddhacarita* 15.27d–38a, but it does not represent the whole vocabulary. Interestingly, this manuscript combines various methods of quoting the Sanskrit text: Sometimes the citation consists of a complete word (e.g., 15.28cd), but in most cases only of the first syllable. Compounds are sometimes cited completely (e.g., 33a–b), sometimes they are reduced to the first syllable of the first member (e.g., 29cd), sometimes each member of the compound is cited by its first syllable (e.g., 32b), and sometimes these methods are mixed (e.g., *sa* for *samyaksmṛti*-, *guṭi* for *-guṭi*- and *gu* for *-guṭaḥ*, together representing the compound *samyaksmṛtiguṭiguṭaḥ* 36c). The sandhi is never resolved (e.g., *amārgāv a* and *mṛ* for *amārgāv amṛtāgamasya* 27d, *lokasaṃjñā* and *m atīndriyaṃ* for *lokasaṃjñām atīndriyaṃ* 28cd, *vārisekai* and *r naiśaṃ tamo* for *vārisekair naiśaṃ tamo* 29a). Altogether, this is not a systematic representation of the Sanskrit text, and it appears impossible to find a convincing explanation for how the original was handled. When we take the format into consideration—reuse of a Chinese scroll containing the *Laṅkāvatārasūtra*<sup>33</sup>—, it does not seem very likely that this manuscript was used in any kind of a ritual context. Rather one could think of it as a scholar’s personal notes—this would at least explain the arbitrary, if not erratic, treatment of the Sanskrit text.

In the following, the small letters in the column of the bilingual refer to the lines and the running numbers applied to the separate units of the text (cf. Maue/Niu 2012: 57, III Critical edition and commentary).

### 80 TBI 774b

b1–2 [a]m[ā]rgāv a • • • • mṛ •  
c4 • pa •  
d6–7 • lokasaṃjñā • • • • m atīndriyaṃ •  
e9 • ma •  
e10 • kim bata •  
e11 • ta •  
f13 • dī •  
f14 • vārisekai •  
f15 • r naiśaṃ tamo •  
g16 • nā •

### Buddhacarita chapter 15

amārgāv amṛ(tāgamasya) 15.27d  
pa(ryākule) 15.28b  
lokasaṃjñām atīndriyaṃ 15.28cd  
correspondence not clear  
kim bata 15.28d  
ta(ttvamārgam) 15.28d  
dī(pena) 15.29a  
vārisekai(r) 15.29a  
(vārisekai)r naiśaṃ tamo 15.29b  
nā(śam) 15.29b

<sup>33</sup>. Cf. Maue/Niu 2012: 45.

g17 • bhyu •	(ihā)bhyu(paiti) 15.29b
g18–19 • jñā • ... • jñānatama •	jñā(nāgninā)jñānatama(s) 15.29c
g20 • bhyeti •	(a)bhyeti 15.29d
h21 • kā •	kā(yakhedaiḥ) 15.29d
h22 • vi •	vi(bhindamś) 15.30a
h23 • pā •	(vi)pā(ṭayamś) (?) 15.30a <sup>34</sup>
h24 • mā •	(naivāgni)m ā(pnoti) 15.30b
h25 • ta •	ta(d eva) 15.30c
i26 • ma •	ma(thnam) 15.30c
i27 • la •	la(bhate) 15.30c
i28 • bhyu •	’bhyu(pāyād) 15.30c
i29 • gā •	(yo)gā(t) <sup>35</sup> 15.30d
i30 • tta •	(yogā)t ta(thāpnoty) 15.30d
i31 • pnoty a •	(tathā)pnoty a(mṛtam) 15.30d
i32 • khe •	khe(dāt) 15.30d
i–j33 • sakto •	sakto 15.31a
j34 • ra •	ra(jas-) 15.31b
j35 • stamobhyā •	(raja)stamobhyā(m) 15.31b
j36 • bhibhūtaceta •	(a)bhibhūtacetā(h) 15.31b
k37 • śakto •	śakto 15.31c
k38 • rthanītāv api •	’rthanītāv api 15.31c
k39 • si •	si(ddhim) 15.31c
k40 • prā •	prā(g eva) 15.31d
k41 • vai •	vai(rāgyavidhau) 15.31d
l42 • vi •	vi(ruddhe) 15.31d
l43 • janto	janto(r) 15.32a
l44 • styā •	(naivā)sty a(pathyānna-) 15.32b
l45 • pathyā •	(a)pathyā(nna-) 15.32b
l46 • nna •	(apathyā)nna- 15.32b
l47 • bhuja •	bhuja(ś) 15.32b
m48 • ś cikits[ā] •	(bhuja)ś cikitsā 15.32b
m49 • ājñāna •	ājñāna- 15.32c
m49a • ro •	ro(gābhihatasya) 15.32c
m50 • sa •	sa(ktasya) 15.32d
n52 • pra •	pra(śāntiḥ) 15.32d
n53 • vahne •	vahne(h) 15.33a
n54 • pavaneritasya •	pavaneritasya 15.33a
n55 • śuṣkāśayasthasya •	śuṣkāśayasthasya 15.33b
o56 • śāntir asti •	śāntir asti 15.33b
o58 • r[ā]gānugatasya •	rāgānugatasya 15.33c

<sup>34</sup>. This would be the very unusual case where not the first akṣara of a word is cited, but see below, i29. The Uigur translation has “and if one is splitting, or cleaving”, which led Maue to suggest *pāṭayati* (Maue/Niu 2012: 62), but the meter requires the first syllable to be short.

<sup>35</sup>. The relevant syllable in the bilingual is very difficult to read, but *gā* seems the best guess. If correct, this would be a second case where a word is not represented by its first syllable (cf. above, h23).

o59 • śā •	śā(ntir) 15.33d
p60 • a •	a(ntāv) 15.34a
p61 • madhyena •	madhyena 15.34b
p62 • mā •	mā(rgo) 15.34b
p63 • dhiga[t]o •	'dhigato 15.34b
p64 • nya •	(mayā)nya(h) 15.34b
p65 • du •	(atyanta)du(hkhopaśamasya) 15.34c
q69 • kṛtapra •	-kṛtapra(kāśo) 15.35a for the emended -(ruci)prakāśo
q70 • [ ]i. •	vi(śuddha-) (?) 15.35b
r72 • vakīṛṇ[a]	unclear <sup>36</sup>
r73 • samyāks[a]muccarita • (sic)	samyaksamuccārita- for samyaksamāvādita- 15.35c (restored in a passage where the ms. is practically illegible)
r74 • vā •	vā(gvihārah) 15.35c
r75 • śu •	śu(bhakriyārāmasabhābhīrāmah) 15.35d
s76 • sa[ ]to •	for sabhā-? 15.35d <sup>37</sup>
s77 • a •	a(garhitājīva-) 15.36a
s78 • jīva •	(agarhitā)jīva- 15.36a
s79 • ma •	ma(hāsubhikṣaḥ) 15.36a
s80 • sa •	sa(myak-) 15.36b
t81 • pra •	pra(yogaprabalānuyātraḥ) 15.36b
t82 • ×ātr[ ] •	-yātraḥ 15.36b
t83 • sa •	sa(myaksmṛti-) 15.36c
t84 • gupti •	-gupti- 15.36c
t85 • gu •	-gu(ptaḥ) 15.36c
u86 • sacchā × nti- • <sup>38</sup>	samādhi- 15.36d <sup>39</sup>
u87 • [ ]ā	-śayyāsana- 15.36d
u88 • vāsabhūmi •	vāsabhūmiḥ 15.36d
u89 • ṣṭāṅga •	'ṣṭāṅga (ihaiṣa) 15.37a
u90 • panthā •	panthā 15.37a
v91 • nirvahako • (sic)	nirvāhako 15.37b
v92 • c/vā •	illegible passage in the manuscript
v93 • rvakāryo •	(kṛtasa)rvakāryo 15.37c
v94 • prayāti •	prayāti 15.37d
v96 • vi •	read viśvam instead of kṛtsnam for mtha' dag 15.38a (ms. nearly illegible at this point), cf. Negi s.v.

<sup>36</sup>. It is impossible to reconcile the quote with 15.35b *viśuddhasaṃkalparathopanītaḥ*; although here the ms. is nearly illegible, the restored wording is supported by Tibetan *rnam dag yang dag rtogs pa'i shing rtas drangs pa ste* (Weller 1926: 259).

<sup>37</sup>. Pāda 35d is read as *śubhakriyārāmasabhābhīrāmah*; however, Tibetan *dge ba'i bya ba'i skyed tshal brgya phrag mngon par dga'* points to -śatā- instead of -sabhā- (Weller 1926: 259).

<sup>38</sup>. The third akṣara is perhaps blotted out.

<sup>39</sup>. Tibetan *ting 'dzin* supports *samādhi*, but *sacchānti* may be a variant.



## Abbreviations

AtüHs I	see Maue 1996.
AtüHs II	see Maue 2015.
Bc	<i>The Buddhacarita or Acts of the Buddha</i> . Ed. and transl. E. H. Johnston. Delhi 1972 (repr. of Lahore 1936).
DTA	Digitales Turfan-Archiv: <a href="http://turfan.bbaw.de/dta/">http://turfan.bbaw.de/dta/</a> .
HWAU	Wilkins, Jens. 2021. <i>Handwörterbuch des Altuigurischen. Altuigurisch – Deutsch – Türkisch</i> . Göttingen: Universitätsverlag.
Negi	Negi, J. S. <i>Tibetan-Sanskrit dictionary</i> (= Bod skad dan legs-sbyar gyi tshig mdzod chen mo). 1st ed., 16 vols. Sarnath, Varanasi: Dictionary Unit Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1993–2005.
SWTF	<i>Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden und der kanonischen Literatur der Sarvāstivāda-Schule</i> , 4 vols. Ed. Heinz Bechert, Klaus Röhrborn, Jens-Uwe Hartmann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994–2018.
TDM	<i>Tridaṇḍamālā</i> .
TochSprR(A)	Emil Sieg und Wolfgang Siegling: <i>Tocharische Sprachreste</i> , I. Bd.: Die Texte, Berlin und Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1921.
TochSprR(B)	Emil Sieg und Wolfgang Siegling: <i>Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B</i> . Im Auftrag der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin herausgegeben. Heft 1: Fragmente Nr. 1–70, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949; Heft 2: Nr. 71–633, aus dem Nachlaß hrsg. von W. Thomas, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953.

## References

- Couvreux, Walter. 1968. “Zu einigen Sanskrit-Kutschischen Listen von Stichwörtern aus dem Catuspariśatsūtra, Daśottarasūtra und Nidānaśaṃyukta.” *Pratidānam. Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies Presented to Franciscus Bernardus Jacobus Kuiper on his Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. J. C. Heesterman, G. H. Schokker, V. I. Subramoniam. The Hague: Mouton, 275–282.
- Dietz, Siglinde, Mehmet Ölmez, Klaus Röhrborn. 2015. *Die alttürkische Xuanzang-Biographie V: Nach der Handschrift von Paris, Peking und St. Petersburg sowie nach dem Transkript von Annemarie v. Gabain ediert, übersetzt und kommentiert*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Eimer, Helmut. 2008. “Überlegungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des tibetischen *Buddhacarita*.” *Bauddha-sāhityastabakāvalī. Essays and Studies on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature Dedicated to Claus Vogel by Colleagues, Students, and Friends*, ed. Dragomir Dimitrov, Michael Hahn and Roland Steiner. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica, 65–77.
- Eltschinger, Vincent. 2013. “Āśvaghoṣa and His Canonical Sources I: Preaching Selflessness to King Bimbisāra and the Magadhans (*Buddhacarita* 16.73–93).” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 41: 167–194.
- Gabain, Annemarie von. 1954. *Türkische Turfan-Texte VIII, Texte in Brāhmīschrift*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Geng Shimin, Hans-Joachim Klimkeit. 1988. *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hāmī-Version der Maitrisimit*, Teil I: Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. Forthcoming. “Forms of Intertextuality and Lost Sanskrit Verses of the *Buddhacarita*: the Tridaṇḍaka and the *Tridaṇḍamālā*.”
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, Kazunobu Matsuda. Forthcoming (2022). “The Case of the Appearing Poet: New Light on Āśvaghoṣa and the *Tridaṇḍamālā*.” *Buddhakṣetrapariśodhana: a Festschrift for Paul Harrison*, ed. Charles DiSimone, Nicholas Witkowski, Marburg: Indica et Tibetica.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, Kazunobu Matsuda, Péter-Dániel Szántó. In print (2022). “The Benefit of Cooperation: Recovering the *Śokavinodana* Ascribed to Āśvaghoṣa”, *Dharmayātrā. Felicitation Volume in Honour of Ven. Tampilawela Dhammaratana*, ed. Jin Siyan, Bhikkhu Pāsādika. Paris: Nuvis Press, (probably) 145–152.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, Dieter Maue. 1991. “Neue Spuren von Mātṛceṭas Varṇārhaṇa.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 141: 69–82.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, Dieter Maue. 1996. “Die indisch-türkische Bilingue TT VIII G.” *Turfan, Khotan und Dunhuang. Vorträge der Tagung “Annemarie v. Gabain und die Turfanforschung”, veranstaltet von der Berlin-Brandenburgischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin (9.–12.12.1994)*, ed. Ronald E. Emmerick, Werner Sundermann, Ingrid Warnke, Peter Zieme. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 147–163.
- Jackson, David P. 1997. “On the Date of the Tibetan Translation of Āśvaghoṣa’s *Buddhacarita*.” *Aspects of Buddhism. Proceedings of the International Seminar on Buddhist Studies. Liw, 25 June 1994*, ed. Agata Bareja-Starzyńska, Marek Mejer. Warszawa: Oriental Institute Warsaw University, 41–62.
- Johnston, E. H. 1937. “The Buddha’s Mission and Last Journey: *Buddhacarita*, xv to xxviii.” *Acta Orientalia* 15: 26–111, 231–292.
- Li, Yong-Söng. 2004. *Türk Dillerinde Sontakılar*. Istanbul: Sanat Kitabevi.

- Martin, Dan. 2014. “Indian *Kāvya* Poetry on the Far Side of the Himalayas: Translation, Transmission, Adaptation, Originality.” *Innovations and Turning Points: Toward a History of Kāvya Literature*, ed. Yigal Bronner, David Shulman, Gary Tubb, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 563–608.
- Matsuda, Kazunobu 松田和信. 2019. “三啓集 (*Tridaṇḍamālā*) における勝義空経とブッダチャリタ Sankeishū (*Tridaṇḍamālā*) niokeru shougikyō to buddacharita. (The *Paramārthaśūnyatā-sūtra* and the *Buddhacarita* in the *Tridaṇḍamālā*).” *印度学佛教学研究 (Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies)* 68-1: 1–11.
- . 2020. “ブッダチャリタ第15章「初転法輪」—梵文テキストと和訳—*Buddacharita dai 15 shō* 'Shotenpōrin'—Bonbun tekisuto to wayaku— (Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation of the *Buddhacarita* Canto 15 ‘The First *Dharmacakṛapavartana*’).” *佛教大学仏教学会紀要 (The Bulletin of the Association of Buddhist Studies, Bukkyo University)*, No. 25: 81–98.
- . Forthcoming. “ブッダチャリタ第16章に見られるアートマン批判—三啓集写本による梵文テキストと和訳— (*Aśvaghōṣa’s Criticism of Ātman in the Buddhacarita Canto 16: Sanskrit Text and Japanese Translation*).” *インド論理学研究 (Indian Logic)* 12.
- Maue, Dieter. 1996. *Altürkische Handschriften. Teil 1: Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XIII, 9).
- . 2015. *Altürkische Handschriften, Teil 19: Dokumente in Brāhmī und tibetischer Schrift*, Teil 2. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland XIII, 27).
- Maue, Dieter, Niu Ruji. 2012. “80 TBI 774 b: A Sanskrit-Uigur Bilingual Text from Bezeklik.” *Studies on the Inner Asian Languages* 27: 43–91.
- Maue, Dieter, Nicholas Sims-Williams. 1991. “Eine sanskrit-sogdische Bilingue in Brāhmī.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 54: 486–495.
- Salomon, Richard. 2012. “Aśvaghōṣa in Central Asia: Some Comments on the Recensional History of His Works in Light of Recent Manuscript Discoveries.” *Buddhism Across Boundaries. The Interplay of Indian, Chinese, and Central Asian Source Materials*, ed. John R. McRae and Jan Nattier. Sino-Platonic Papers 222: 86–105.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1955. “Zu einigen Bilinguen aus den Turfan-Funden.” *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist.Kl.*, 1–20 [repr. in E. Waldschmidt. *Von Ceylon bis Turfan, Schriften zur Geschichte, Literatur, Religion und Kunst des indischen Kulturraumes (Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967, 238–257].
- Weller, Friedrich. 1926. *Das Leben des Buddha: tibetisch und deutsch*. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer.
- . 1953. “Zwei zentralasiatische Fragmente des *Buddhacarita*.” *Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, Band 46, Heft 4. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Wilkens, Jens. 2007. *Das Buch von der Sündentilgung. Edition des alttürkisch-buddhistischen Kṣanti Kulguluk Nom Bitig*, Turnhout: Brepols (Berliner Turfantexte, 25).
- Willemen, Charles. 2009. *Buddhacarita: In Praise of Buddha’s Acts* (Taishō Volume 4, Number 192). Moraga: BDK America.
- Zieme, Peter. 1985. *Buddhistische Stabreimdichtungen der Uiguren*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Berliner Turfantexte, 13).
- . 2014. “Drei altuigurische Fragmente aus dem Buddhaleben.” *Kutadgu Nom Bitig. Festschrift für Jens Peter Laut zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Elisabetta Ragagnin und Jens Wilkens. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 621–634.
- . 2021. “Ein altuigurisches Dharmaśāstrasūtra nach einer chinesischen Version.” *International Journal of Old Uyghur Studies* 3/1: 5–18.